arXiv:1611.07172v1 [math.NA] 22 Nov 2016

Convergence of the immersed-boundary finite-element method for the Stokes problem

Norikazu SAITO* Yoshiki SUGITANI†

November 23, 2016

Convergence results for the immersed boundary method applied to a model Stokes problem with the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition are presented. As a discretization method, we deal with the finite element method. First, the immersed force field is approximated using a regularized delta function and its error in the $W^{-1,p}$ norm is examined for $1 \le p < n/(n-1)$, n being the space dimension. Then, we consider the immersed boundary discretization of the Stokes problem and study the regularization and discretization errors separately. Consequently, error estimate of order $h^{1-\alpha}$ in the $W^{1,1} \times L^1$ norm for the velocity and pressure is derived, where α is an arbitrarily small positive number. Error estimate of order $h^{1-\alpha}$ in the L^r norm for the velocity is also derived with $r = n/(n-1-\alpha)$. The validity of those theoretical results are confirmed by numerical examples.

Key words: immersed boundary method, finite element method, Stokes equation

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 65N30, 65N15, 35Q30, 74F10

1 Introduction

The immersed boundary (IB) method is a powerful method for solving a class of fluid-structure interaction problems originally proposed by Peskin [11, 12] to simulate the blood flow through artificial heart valves. For later developments, see [13]. The IB method is also successfully applied to multi-phase flow problems, elliptic interface problems, and so on.

*Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. *E-mail*: norikazu@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

†Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba 3-8-1, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. *E-mail*: sugitani@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

In contrast to a huge number of applications, it seems that there are only a few results about theoretical convergence analysis. The pioneering work was done by Y. Mori in 2008 (see [10]). He studied a model (stationary) Stokes problem for the velocity u and pressure q in an n dimensional torus $U = [\mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})]^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$-\Delta u + \nabla q = f - g \text{ in } U, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } U, \tag{0}$$

with

$$f(x) = \int_\Xi F(\theta)\delta(x - X(\theta))\ d\theta, \quad g = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n}\int_\Theta F(\theta)\ d\theta.$$

Herein, the *immersed boundary* $\Gamma \subset U$, which is assumed to be a hypersurface of $\mathbb{R}^n$, is parameterizaed as

$$\Gamma = \{X(\theta) = (X_1(\theta), \dots, X_n(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \Theta\},$$

where Θ denotes a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$; see Figure 1. The function $F = F(\theta)$ denotes the force distributed along Γ and $\delta = \delta(x)$ the (scalar-valued) Dirac delta function. (In [10], the case $n = 2$ was explicitly mentioned.) Introducing the regularized delta function $\delta^h \approx \delta$ with a parameter $h > 0$, he considered the regularized Stokes problem

$$-\Delta\tilde{u} + \nabla\tilde{q} = \int_\Xi F(\theta)\delta^h(x - X(\theta))\ d\theta - g \text{ in } U, \quad \nabla \cdot \tilde{u} = 0 \text{ in } U.$$

The regularized problem was discretized by the finite difference method using a uniform Eulerian grid with grid size h. Then, he succeeded in deriving the maximum norm error estimate for the velocity of the form

$$\|u - \tilde{u}_h\|_{L^\infty(U)} \le C(h + h^\alpha)|\log h| \quad (\alpha > 0 \text{ suitable constant})$$

under regularity assumptions on Γ and F together with structural assumptions on δ^h. Herein, $\tilde{u}_h$ denotes the finite difference solution. After that, the method and results were extended to several directions (see [7, 8]). For example, several L^p-error estimates, $1 \le p \le \infty$, were obtained in [8]. A typical result is given as

$$\|u - \tilde{u}_h\|_{L^p(U)} + h\|q - \tilde{q}_h\|_{L^p(U)} \le Ch^2|\log h|^\eta \quad (\eta > 0 \text{ suitable constant}).$$

Similar results for the Poisson interface problem was presented in [6]. On the other hand, we observe from numerical experiments that the IB method has a first order accuracy for the velocity in the L^∞ norm. Therefore, those estimates are only sub-optimal and the proof of optimal-order error estimate is still open at present. Moreover, the explicit formula of the Green function associated with (0) was used to derive error estimates in [7, 8, 10]. Hence, it is difficult to apply those methods to more standard settings, for example, to the Dirichlet boundary value problem.

In this paper, we take a different approach. We consider the Dirichlet boundary value problem for the Stokes equations (5) below and study the *regularization error and discretized error separately* in Sections 2 and 3. To this end, we first give interpretations



Figure 1: $\overline{\Omega} = \overline{\Omega_0 \cup \Omega_1}$, Ω_0, Ω_1 and Γ.

of the immersed outer force f above as an $\mathbb{R}^n$-Lebesgue measure and as a functional over $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^n$; see Propositions 1 and 2. (The meaning of mathematical symbols will be mentioned in Paragraph 2.1.) Then, we introduce a regularized delta function δ^ε with a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ and examine the error between f and its regularization

$$f^\varepsilon(x) = \int_\Xi F(\theta)\delta^\varepsilon(x - X(\theta))\, d\theta$$

in the $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)^n$ norm for $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$; see Proposition 3. Estimate for the regularization error (see Proposition 8) is a direct consequence of Proposition 3 and the stability result of [9] (or $(\mathrm{A1}_p)$ below). After introducing structural assumptions on δ^ε,

$$\delta^\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^n} \prod_{i=1}^n \phi\left(\frac{x_i}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

that is essentially the same as that of [7, 8, 10], we show that the $W^{1,p} \times L^p$ error estimate for the velocity and pressure is of order $\varepsilon^{1-n+\frac{n}{p}}$ if $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$; see Proposition 9.

Then, we proceed to the study of discretization in Section 3 . We are concerned with the finite element method rather than the finite difference method. This enable us to apply several sharp $W^{1,p} \times L^p$ stability and error estimates due to [4] (or $(\mathrm{A2}_p)$ below). Finally, we obtain several (still sub-optimal but nearly-optimal) error estimates in several norms; see Theorem 15 which is the main result of this paper. The effect of numerical integration for computing f^ε is discussed in Section 4. Actually, a simple numerical integration formula does not spoil the accuracy of the IB method (see Proposition 18 and Theorem 19). The validity of those theoretical results are confirmed by numerical examples in Section 5.

We only assume that ϕ is a continuous function in $\mathbb{R}$ with compact support and with the unit mean value (see (12)). On the other hand, several conditions on moment and smoothing orders of ϕ were assumed in [7, 8, 10]; we are able to remove those restrictions.

It should be kept in mind that our aim is to reveal the accuracy of the regularization and discretization procedures and is not to propose a new computational method; see

also Remark 5. We consider the finite element method only as a model discretization method.

2 Immersed boundary formulation

2.1 Geometry and notation

Suppose that Ω is a polyhedral domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2, 3$, with the boundary $\partial\Omega$. The domain Ω is divided into two disjoint components Ω_0 and Ω_1 by a simple closed curve ($n = 2$) or surface ($n = 3$) which is designated by Γ. The curve (surface) Γ is called the *immersed boundary* and is supposed to be parametrized as $\Gamma = \{X(\theta) = (X_1(\theta), \dots, X_n(\theta)) \mid \theta \in \Theta\}$ where Θ is a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ for the Lagrangian coordinate. See Fig. 1 for example. We set

$$J_X(\theta) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\left|\frac{\partial X_1}{\partial\theta}\right|^2 + \left|\frac{\partial X_2}{\partial\theta}\right|^2} & \text{if } n = 2, \\ \sqrt{\left|\frac{\partial(X_2,X_3)}{\partial(\theta_1,\theta_2)}\right|^2 + \left|\frac{\partial(X_3,X_1)}{\partial(\theta_1,\theta_2)}\right|^2 + \left|\frac{\partial(X_1,X_2)}{\partial(\theta_1,\theta_2)}\right|^2} & \text{if } n = 3. \end{cases}$$

Throughout this paper, we assume the following:

- Γ is a C^1 boundary ($X(\theta)$ is a C^1 function);
- $\mathrm{dist}(\Gamma, \partial\Omega) > 0$;
- $J_X(\theta) \neq 0 \quad (\theta \in \Theta)$.

We collect here the notation used in this paper. We follow the notation of [1] for function spaces and their norms. For a function space X, the space X^n stands for a product space $X \times \cdots \times X$. For abbreviations, we write as, for example,

$$\|u\|_{W^{1,p}} = \|u\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)^n}, \qquad \|\pi\|_{L^p} = \|\pi\|_{L^p(\Omega)}.$$

We set $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega) = \{v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \mid v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}$ and $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)$ the topological dual of $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$. The dual product between $W^{-1,p}(\Omega)^n$ and $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^n$ is denoted by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{W^{-1,p},W_0^{1,p}}$. We let $L_0^p(\Omega) = \{q \in L^p(\Omega) \mid \int_\Omega q\, dx = 0\}$. Set $B(a,r) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid |x - a| < r\}$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $r > 0$.

For $1 \le p \le \infty$, let p' be the conjugate exponent of p; $1 \le p' \le \infty$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$.

For vectors $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let us denote by $a \cdot b = a_1b_1 + \cdots + a_nb_n$ the scalar product.

2.2 Immersed boundary force

We set (formally at this stage) the immersed boundary force field $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$f = \int_\Theta F(\theta)\delta_{X(\theta)}\, d\theta \tag{1}$$

for $F \in L^1(\Theta)^n$. Hereinafter, we set $\delta_a(x) = \delta(x-a)$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We have (still formally)

$$\int_\Omega f(x) \cdot \varphi(x)\ dx = \int_\Theta F(\theta) \cdot \varphi(X(\theta))\ d\theta \qquad (\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^n). \tag{2}$$

We state two interpretations of (2).

Proposition 1. *Let $F \in L^1(\Theta)^n$. Then, f defined as (1) is a finitely signed measure on Ω, with which the integration is defined for any (vector-valued) measurable function φ on Ω. In particular, if $F \in L^p(\Theta)^n$ for $1 \le p \le \infty$, the integrant is given by*

$$\langle f, \varphi \rangle = \int_\Omega \varphi\ df = \int_\Theta F(\theta) \cdot \varphi(X(\theta))\ d\theta$$

for any $\varphi \in W^{1,p'}(\Omega)^n$. Moreover, f is a singular measure against the Lebesgue measure on Ω and, consequently, $f \notin L^1(\Omega)^n$.

Proof. We identify $\delta_a(x) = \delta(x-a)$ with the Dirac measure concentrated at $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, for any measurable set $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\theta \in \Theta$, we have

$$\delta_{X(\theta)}(B) = 1_{X^{-1}(B)}(\theta) = \begin{cases} 1 & (X(\theta) \in B) \\ 0 & (X(\theta) \notin B), \end{cases}$$

where $1_{X^{-1}(B)}$ denotes the indicator function of $X^{-1}(B)$ on Θ. By virtue of Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we derive for any disjoint measurable sets $\{B_n\}_n$

$$\begin{aligned} f\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty B_n\right) &= \int_\Theta F(\theta) \sum_{n=1}^\infty \delta_{X(\theta)}(B_n)\ d\theta = \int_\Theta F(\theta) \sum_{n=1}^\infty 1_{X^{-1}(B_n)}(\theta)\ d\theta \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_\Theta F(\theta) 1_{X^{-1}(B_n)}(\theta)\ d\theta = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_\Theta F(\theta) \delta_{X(\theta)}(B_n)\ d\theta \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty f(B_n). \end{aligned}$$

Herein, note that $F(\theta) \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{X^{-1}(B_n)}(\theta)$ is integrable for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ since $F \in L^1(\Theta)^n$ and B_n is disjoint. It follows $f(\emptyset) = 0$ from $\delta_a(\emptyset) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Thus, f is a finitely signed measure on Ω so that the integral $\int_\Omega \varphi\, df$ is well-defined for all measurable function φ. According to an integral with the Dirac measure, we have

$$\int_\Omega \varphi\ df = \int_\Theta F(\theta) \cdot \varphi(X(\theta))\ d\theta,$$

where the right hand side is meaningful for $F \in L^p(\Theta)^n$ and $\varphi \in W^{1,p'}(\Omega)^n$. Although the $\mathbb{R}^n$-Lebesgue measure $m(\Gamma)$ of Γ vanishes (note that Γ is "very thin"), we have $f(\Gamma) \neq 0$. Hence, f is singular against m. Finally, the fact $f \notin L^1(\Omega)$ follows from the Lebesgue decomposition theorem. □

Although f does not belong to any $L^p(\Omega)$ spaces as is mentioned in Proposition 1, it is well-defined as a functional on $W^{1,p}(\Omega)^n$.

Proposition 2. *Let $1 \le p < \infty$ and $F \in L^p(\Theta)^n$. Then, the functional*

$$\langle f, \varphi \rangle = \int_\Theta F(\theta) \cdot \varphi(X(\theta))\ d\theta \quad (\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^n)$$

is extended by continuity to a bounded linear functional on $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^n$, which will be denoted by $\langle f, \cdot \rangle_{W^{-1,p}, W_0^{1,p}}$ below. That is, we have $f \in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)^n$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^n$. Since

$$\int_\Gamma |\ \varphi|_\Gamma\ |^{p'}\ \ d\Gamma = \int_\Theta |\ \varphi(X(\theta))\ |^{p'}\ |J_X(\theta)|\ d\theta,$$

we have by the trace theorem

$$\begin{aligned}\langle f, \varphi \rangle &\le \|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \left(\int_\Theta |\ \varphi(X(\theta))\ |^{p'}\ \ d\theta \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\ &\le \|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \|J_X\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}^{-\frac{1}{p'}} \|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}(\Gamma)} \le C \|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a regularized parameter. Take a continuous function $\delta^\varepsilon = \delta^\varepsilon(x)$ satisfying

$$\operatorname{supp} \delta^\varepsilon \subset B(0, K\varepsilon) \tag{3}$$

with $K > 0$.

Setting $\delta_a^\varepsilon(x) = \delta^\varepsilon(x - a)$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we introduce the *regularized immersed force field* as

$$f^\varepsilon = \int_\Theta F(\theta) \delta_{X(\theta)}^\varepsilon\ d\theta. \tag{4}$$

Since $\delta_a^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have $f^\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $F \in L^1(\Theta)$. The following result plays the most crucial role in this study.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that we are given a continuous function δ^ε satisfying* (3)*. Then, for $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$ and $F \in L^p(\Theta)$, we have*

$$\|f - f^\varepsilon\|_{W^{-1,p}} \le C_0 \|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \left[\left| 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy \right| + \|\rho \delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \right],$$

where $\rho(x) = x$ and C_0 denotes a positive constant depending only on n, p and $\|J_X\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^n$ and express it as

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi(X(\theta)) + (x - X(\theta)) \cdot \int_0^1 \nabla\varphi(t(x - X(\theta)) + X(\theta))\ dt \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Then, applying Fubini's lemma, we have

$$\langle f - f^\varepsilon, \varphi\rangle = \underbrace{\int_\Theta F(\theta)\varphi(X(\theta)) \left(1 - \int_\Omega \delta^\varepsilon_{X(\theta)}(x)\ dx\right)\ d\theta}_{=I_1}$$
$$\underbrace{- \int_0^1 \int_\Theta F(\theta) \int_\Omega \delta^\varepsilon_{X(\theta)}(x)(x - X(\theta)) \cdot \nabla\varphi(t(x - X(\theta)) + X(\theta))\ dxd\theta dt}_{=I_2}.$$

For a sufficiently small ε, we have $B(X(\theta), K\varepsilon) \subset \Omega$ and

$$\int_\Omega \delta^\varepsilon_{X(\theta)}\ dx = \int_{B(X(\theta),K\varepsilon)} \delta^\varepsilon_{X(\theta)}(x)\ dx = \int_{B(0,K\varepsilon)} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\le \left|1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy\right| \int_\Theta |F(\theta)| \cdot |\varphi(X(\theta))|\ d\theta \\
&\le \|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \left(\int_\Theta |\varphi(X(\theta))|^{p'}\ d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} \left|1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy\right| \\
&\le \frac{\|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)}}{\|J_X\|^{1/p'}_{L^\infty(\Theta)}} \|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}(\Gamma)} \left|1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy\right| \\
&\le C\|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \left|1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy\right| \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By virtue of Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &\le \int_0^1 \int_\Theta |F(\theta)| \cdot \|(x - X(\theta))\delta^\varepsilon_{X(\theta)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \cdot \\
&\qquad \cdot \left[\int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi(t(x - X(\theta)) + X(\theta))|^{p'}\ dx\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\ d\theta dt \\
&\le \|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_0^1 \int_\Theta |F(\theta)| \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla\tilde{\varphi}(t(x - X(\theta)) + X(\theta))|^{p'}\ dx\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}}\ d\theta \\
&\le \|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \int_0^1 \int_\Theta |F(\theta)|\ d\theta \left[\frac{1}{t^n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla\tilde{\varphi}(z)|^{p'}\ dz\right]^{\frac{1}{p'}} \\
&\le \|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|F\|_{L^1(\Theta)} \left(\int_0^1 t^{-\frac{n}{p'}}\ dt\right) \|\tilde{\varphi}\|_{W^{1,p'}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\
&\le \frac{p'}{p' - n} \|F\|_{L^1(\Theta)} \|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}$ denotes the zero extension of φ into $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $z = t(x - X(\theta)) + X(\theta)$. (Note that $n < p' \le \infty$ by $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$.) □

Remark 4. We take $\varphi_0 \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying

$$\varphi_0(x) = 1 \text{ if } x \in \Gamma(\varepsilon) = \{x \in \Omega \mid \operatorname{dist}(x, \Gamma) < \varepsilon\} \cup \Omega_0.$$

Then, I_2 in the proof above vanishes and

$$\|f - f^\varepsilon\|_{W^{-1,p}} \ge \frac{\langle f - f^\varepsilon, \varphi_0 \rangle}{\|\varphi_0\|_{W^{1,p'}}} = \frac{1}{\|\varphi_0\|_{W^{1,p'}}} \int_\Theta F(\theta)\, d\theta \left[1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(x)\, dx\right].$$

Hence,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(x)\, dx \to 1 \quad (\varepsilon \to 0)$$

is a necessary condition for $\|f - f^\varepsilon\|_{W^{-1,p}} \to 0$ to hold.

2.3 Target and regularized problems

We proceed to the formulation of the immersed boundary method. Using f and f^ε defined by (1) and (4), we consider, respectively, the immersed boundary formulation to the Stokes equations for the velocity u and pressure π,

$$-\nu\Delta u + \nabla\pi = f \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \tag{5}$$

and its regularized problem for u^ε and π^ε,

$$-\nu\Delta u^\varepsilon + \nabla\pi^\varepsilon = f^\varepsilon \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \nabla \cdot u^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u^\varepsilon = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \tag{6}$$

By a *weak solution* $(u, \pi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^n \times L_0^p(\Omega)$ of (5) for example, we mean a solution of the following variational equations: Find $(u, \pi) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^n \times L_0^p(\Omega)$ such that

$$a(u, v) + b(\pi, v) = \langle f, v \rangle_{W^{-1,p}, W_0^{1,p}} \qquad (\forall v \in W_0^{1,p'}(\Omega)^n), \tag{7a}$$

$$b(q, u) = 0 \qquad (\forall q \in L_0^{p'}(\Omega)), \tag{7b}$$

where

$$a(u, v) = \frac{\nu}{2} \int_\Omega \left(\frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}\right)\left(\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_i} + \frac{\partial v_i}{\partial x_j}\right) dx, \tag{8a}$$

$$b(\pi, u) = -\int_\Omega \pi(\nabla \cdot u)\, dx. \tag{8b}$$

Remark 5. Problem (7) can be directly discretized by the finite element method with no regularization of f. Such methods were studied in [2, 14] for nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations. However, our aim here is to reveal the accuracy of the regularization and discretization procedures as is mentioned in Introduction.

Remark 6. The bilinear form a defined by (8a) is based on the deformation-rate tensor $[(1/2)(u_{i,j}+u_{j,i})]_{1\le i,j\le n}$. Another definition

$$a(u,v)=\nu\int_\Omega \frac{\partial u_j}{\partial x_i}\frac{\partial v_j}{\partial x_i}\,dx$$

is also available. However, with (8a), our problem is (essentially) equivalent to a two-phase Stokes problem considered in [14] for example.

We make the following assumption for $1\le p<\infty$:

(A1$_p$) For a given $g\in W^{-1,p}(\Omega)^n$, there exists a unique weak solution $(w,r)\in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)\times L_0^p(\Omega)$ of the Stokes problem,

$$-\nu\Delta w+\nabla r=g \text{ in } \Omega,\quad \nabla\cdot w=0 \text{ in } \Omega,\quad w=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \tag{9}$$

satisfying

$$\|w\|_{W^{1,p}}+\|r\|_{L^p}\le C_1\|g\|_{W^{-1,p}}. \tag{10}$$

Moreover, if $g\in W^{-1,2}(\Omega)^n\cap L^p(\Omega)$, we have $(w,r)\in W^{2,p}(\Omega)\times W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ and

$$\|w\|_{W^{2,p}}+\|r\|_{W^{1,p}}\le C_2\|g\|_{L^p}. \tag{11}$$

Herein, C_1 and C_2 denote positive constants depending only on p and Ω.

Remark 7. If Ω is a convex Lipschitz domain and $1<p\le 2$, (A1$_p$) is satisfied in view of [9, Example 5.5] and Lemma 2. However, we directly assume (A1$_p$) instead of the shape condition on Ω. Below, p will be restricted as $p<n/(n-1)$.

The following result is a direct consequence of Lemma 3 and (A1$_p$).

Proposition 8. *Let $1\le p<\frac{n}{n-1}$ and suppose that* (A1$_p$) *is satisfied. Let $F\in L^p(\Theta)$. Let (u,π) and $(u^\varepsilon,\pi^\varepsilon)$ be the weak solutions of* (5) *and* (6)*, respectively. Then, we have*

$$\|u-u^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}}+\|\pi-\pi^\varepsilon\|_{L^p}\le C_0C_1\|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)}\left[\left|1-\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\delta^\varepsilon(y)\,dy\right|+\|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)}\right].$$

The most familiar choice of δ^ε is given by a product of one variable functions:

$$\delta^\varepsilon(x)=\frac{1}{\varepsilon^n}\prod_{i=1}^n\phi\left(\frac{x_i}{\varepsilon}\right)\quad (x=(x_1,\dots,x_n)); \tag{12a}$$

$$\phi \text{ is continuous in } \mathbb{R},\quad \operatorname{supp}\phi\subset B(0,K\varepsilon),\quad \int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi(s)\,ds=1 \tag{12b}$$

with $K>0$. In (12a), the function $(1/\varepsilon)\phi(x_i/\varepsilon)$ is an approximation of the one-dimensional Dirac delta. Then, we can calculate as:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\delta^\varepsilon(y)\,dy=1; \tag{13a}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|y|^p|\delta^\varepsilon(y)|^p\,dy\le C_3\varepsilon^{p-pn+n}; \tag{13b}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}|\delta^\varepsilon(y)|^p\,dy\le C_3'\varepsilon^{-pn+n}, \tag{13c}$$

where C_3 and C_3' denote positive constants depending only on p, n, K and $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$. For example, if $n = 3$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |y|^p |\delta^\varepsilon(y)|^p \, dy \\
&\quad \le \varepsilon^{p-pn+n} \int_0^{\sqrt{n}K} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{\pi} s^{p+n-1} |\phi(s\cos\varphi\sin\theta)|^p \cdot \\
&\qquad \cdot |\phi(s\sin\varphi\sin\theta)|^p |\phi(s\cos\theta)|^p \sin\theta \, dsd\varphi d\theta \\
&\quad \le \frac{4\pi}{p+n} (\sqrt{3}K)^{p+n} \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^{3p} \varepsilon^{p-pn+n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can take $C_3 = \frac{2\pi}{p+2}(\sqrt{2}K)^{p+2}\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^{2p}$ if $n = 2$.

Therefore, our error estimate for the regularized problem is given as follows.

Proposition 9. *Let $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$ and suppose that $(\mathrm{A1}_p)$ is satisfied. Let $F \in L^p(\Theta)$. Let (u, p) and $(u^\varepsilon, p^\varepsilon)$, respectively, be the weak solutions of (5) and (6) with (12). Then, we have*

$$\|u - u^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|p - p^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \le C\|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \varepsilon^{1-n+\frac{n}{p}}, \tag{14}$$

where C denotes a positive constant depending only on n, p, $\|J_X\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, K, $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and Ω.

Remark 10. Proposition 9 remains valid for a bounded Lipschitz domain Ω.

3 Discretization by finite element method

This section is devoted to a study of the finite element approximation applied to (6). We introduce a family of regular triangulations $\{\mathscr{T}_h\}_h$ of Ω (see [3, (4.4.16)]). Hereinafter, we set $h = \max\{h_T \mid T \in \mathscr{T}_h\}$, where h_T denotes the diameter of T. For any $T \in \mathscr{T}_h$, let $\mathscr{P}_1(T)$ be the set of all polynomials defined on T of degree ≤ 1, and let $\mathscr{B}(T) = [\mathscr{P}_1(T) \oplus \mathrm{span}\{\lambda_1\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_{n+1}\}]^n$, where λ_i are the barycentric coordinates of T. Below, we consider the P1-b/P1 element (MINI element) approximation. That is, set

$$\begin{aligned}
V_h &= \{v_h \in C(\overline{\Omega})^n \cap W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)^n \mid v_h|_T \in \mathscr{B}(T) \ (\forall T \in \mathscr{T}_h)\}, \\
Q_h &= \{q_h \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap L_0^2(\Omega) \mid q_h|_T \in \mathscr{P}_1(T) \ (\forall T \in \mathscr{T}_h)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is well-known that (see [5, Lemma II.4.1]) a pair of V_h and Q_h satisfies the uniform Babuška–Brezzi (inf–sup) condition

$$\sup_{v_h \in V_h} \frac{b(v_h, q_h)}{\|v_h\|_{W^{1,2}}} \ge \beta \|q_h\|_{L^2} \qquad (q_h \in Q_h),$$

where $\beta > 0$ is independent of h.

Remark 11. We deal with the P1-b/P1 element only for the sake of simple presentation. An arbitrary pair of conforming finite element spaces $V_h \subset W_0^{1,2}(\Omega)^n$ and $Q_h \subset L_0^2(\Omega)$ satisfying the uniform Babuška–Brezzi condition is available.

We state the finite element approximation to (6): Find $(u_h^\varepsilon, \pi_h^\varepsilon) \in V_h \times Q_h$ such that

$$a(u_h^\varepsilon, v_h) + b(\pi_h^\varepsilon, v_h) = (f^\varepsilon, v_h)_{L^2} \qquad (\forall v_h \in V_h), \tag{15a}$$

$$b(q_h, u_h^\varepsilon) = 0 \qquad (\forall q_h \in Q_h). \tag{15b}$$

The finite element approximation $(w_h, r_h) \in V_h \times Q_h$ of (9) is defined similarly.

We make the following assumption:

(A2$_p$) For a given $g \in L^p(\Omega)^n$, the finite element approximation $(w_h, r_h) \in V_h \times Q_h$ of (9) admits

$$\|w - w_h\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|r - r_h\|_{L^p} \le C_4 \inf_{(v_h, q_h) \in V_h \times Q_h} \left(\|w - v_h\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|r - q_h\|_{L^p} \right),$$

where C_4 denotes a positive constant depending only on p and Ω, and $(w, r) \in W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)^n \times L_0^p(\Omega)$ the weak solution of (9).

Remark 12. If Ω is a convex polyhedral domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n = 2, 3$ and $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ is quasi-uniform (see [3, (4.4.15)]), then (A2$_p$) is actually satisfied for $1 < p \le \infty$; see Corollaries 4, 5, 6 and Remark 4 of a sophisticated paper [4]. However, we directly assume (A2$_p$) instead of the shape condition on Ω as before.

Applying the standard interpolation/projection error estimates, we obtain the following.

Proposition 13. *Let $1 \le p < \infty$ and suppose that* (A1$_p$) *and* (A2$_p$) *are satisfied. Let $(u^\varepsilon, \pi^\varepsilon)$ and $(u_h^\varepsilon, \pi_h^\varepsilon)$ be solutions of* (6) *and* (15)*, respectively. Then, we have*

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\pi^\varepsilon - \pi_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \le Ch \|f^\varepsilon\|_{L^p}, \tag{16}$$

where C denotes a positive constant depending only on p and Ω.

Putting together those results, we deduce the following error estimate.

Proposition 14. *Let $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$ and suppose that* (A1$_p$) *and* (A2$_p$) *are satisfied. Assume $F \in L^{p'}(\Theta)$. Let (u, π) and $(u_h^\varepsilon, \pi_h^\varepsilon)$ be solutions of* (5) *and* (15) *with* (12)*, respectively. Then, we have*

$$\|u - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\pi - \pi_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \le C\varepsilon^{-n+\frac{n}{p}}(\varepsilon + h), \tag{17}$$

where C denotes a positive constant depending only on n, p, $\|J_X\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, $\mathrm{meas}(\Theta)$, K, $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$, $\|F\|_{L^p(\Theta)}$, $\|F\|_{L^{p'}(\Theta)}$ and Ω.

Proof. Since f^ε is defined in terms of δ^ε given by (12), we have by (13c)

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} &\le \mathrm{meas}(\Theta)^{1/p} \|F\|_{L^{p'}(\Theta)} \|\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \\ &\le C\,\mathrm{meas}(\Theta)^{1/p} \|F\|_{L^{p'}(\Theta)} \varepsilon^{-n+\frac{n}{p}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant depending only on p, n, K, and $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$. Hence, in view of Lemmas 9 and 13,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\pi - \pi_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} &\le \|u - u^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\pi - \pi^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \\ &\quad + \|u^\varepsilon - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,p}} + \|\pi^\varepsilon - \pi_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^p} \\ &\le C\varepsilon^{1-n+\frac{n}{p}} + Ch \cdot C\varepsilon^{-n+\frac{n}{p}}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We usually take as $\varepsilon = h$ in the immersed boundary method. Therefore, applying Proposition 14 with $p = 1$, we obtain the optimal order error estimate

$$\|u - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,1}} + \|\pi - \pi_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^1} \le Ch. \tag{18}$$

It should be kept in mind that this estimate is available only if $(\mathrm{A1}_p)$ and $(\mathrm{A2}_p)$ are true. However, the case $p = 1$ is excluded both in [9] and [4] (see Remarks 7 and 12). In conclusion, we offer the following theorem as the final error estimate in this paper.

Theorem 15. *Suppose that Ω is a convex polyhedral domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $n = 2, 3$. Assume that $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_h$ is a family of quasi-uniform triangulations. Let $F \in L^\infty(\Theta)$. Let (u, π) and $(u_h^\varepsilon, \pi_h^\varepsilon)$ be solutions of (5) and (15) with (12), respectively. Further, let $\varepsilon = \gamma_1 h$ with a positive constant γ_1. Then, for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, there exists a positive constant C depending only on γ_1, n, α, Ω, K, $\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$, $\|J_X\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, $\mathrm{meas}(\Theta)$, and $\|F\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$ such that*

$$\|u - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,q}} + \|\pi - \pi_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^q} \le Ch^{1-\alpha} \quad \text{with any } 1 \le q \le \frac{n}{n-\alpha} \tag{19}$$

and

$$\|u - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^r} \le Ch^{1-\alpha} \quad \text{with} \quad r = \frac{n}{n-\alpha-1}. \tag{20}$$

Proof. As was pointed out in Remarks 7 and 12, $(\mathrm{A1}_p)$ and $(\mathrm{A2}_p)$ are true for a convex polyhedral domain. Setting $\alpha = n(1 - 1/p)$ in (17) and applying an obvious inequality $\|\psi\|_{L^q} \le C\|\psi\|_{L^p}$ for $1 \le q \le n/(n-\alpha)$, we deduce (19). Inequality (20) is a consequence of (17) and the Sobolev embedding theorem (see [1, Theorem 4.12, Part I, Case C]). □

Remark 16. The exponent r in (20) is included in $2 < r < \infty$ if $n = 2$ and in $3/2 < r < 3$ if $n = 3$.

4 Numerical integration

In this section, we study the error caused by numerical integrations for computing f^ε. As will be stated below, a simple numerical integration formula does not spoil the accuracy of the immersed boundary method described in Theorem 15.

First, we deal with the case $n = 2$. Suppose that we are given a continuous function $F(\theta)$ in $\Theta = (c_1, d_1)$ with $c_1 < d_1$. Let us introduce a partition $c_1 = \theta_0 < \theta_1 < \cdots <$

$\theta_M = d_1$. Moreover, letting $\theta_{-\frac{1}{2}} = \theta_0$, $\theta_{i-\frac{1}{2}} = (\theta_i + \theta_{i-1})/2$ for $1 \le i \le M$, and $\theta_{M+\frac{1}{2}} = \theta_M$, we set $\zeta_i = \theta_{i+\frac{1}{2}} - \theta_{i-\frac{1}{2}}$ for $0 \le i \le M$. Further, set $\zeta = \max_{0\le i\le M} \zeta_i$. Then, we employ the midpoint rule to compute f^ε, that is,

$$f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{M} F(\theta_i)\delta^\varepsilon_{X(\theta_i)}(x)\zeta_i = \sum_{i=0}^{M} F(\theta_i)\delta^\varepsilon(x - X(\theta_i))\zeta_i. \tag{21}$$

It is useful to express $f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ as

$$f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}(x) = \int_\Theta \hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)\delta^\varepsilon(x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta))\ d\theta, \tag{22}$$

where $\hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)$ and $\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta) = (\hat{X}^\zeta_1(\theta), \hat{X}^\zeta_2(\theta))$ are piecewise constant functions such that

$$\hat{F}^\zeta(\theta) = F(\theta_i), \quad \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta) = X(\theta_i) \qquad (\theta_{i-\frac{1}{2}} < \theta \le \theta_{i+\frac{1}{2}},\ 0 \le i \le M).$$

From the standard theory, we know

$$\|F - \hat{F}^\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)} \le C\zeta|F|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)}, \tag{23a}$$

$$\|X - \hat{X}^\zeta\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)^n} \le C\zeta|X|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)^n}, \tag{23b}$$

where $|F|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)}$ denotes the seminorm in $W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)$ for example.

For the case of $n = 3$, $f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ is defined similary. We introduce a suitable partition of $\Theta = (c_1, d_1) \times (c_2, d_2)$ with $c_l < d_l$, $l = 1, 2$, and the size parameter $\zeta > 0$. Let $\hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)$ and $\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)$ be piecewise constant interpolations of $F(\theta)$ and $X(\theta)$, respectively. Then, f^ε is approximated by $f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ defined as (22). For the partition of Θ, we only assume so that (23) hold true.

Remark 17. Let $n = 2$. If $F(\theta)$ is a periodic function, $F(c_1) = F(d_1)$, and the partition is uniform, $f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ is coincide with the trapezoidal rule for $F(\theta)\delta^\varepsilon(x - X(\theta))$. However, we here do not explicitly assume the periodicity for $F(\theta)$.

Proposition 18. *Let δ^ε be a continuous function satisfying* (3). *Suppose that $F \in C^1(\Theta)$. Then, for $1 \le p < \frac{n}{n-1}$, we have*

$$\|f - f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}\|_{W^{-1,p}} \le C\left[\left|1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy\right| + \|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} + \zeta + \zeta^{1-n+\frac{n}{p}}\right],$$

where $\rho(x) = x$ and C denotes a positive constant depending only on n, p, $\|J_X\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, $|F|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)}$ and $|X|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)^n}$.

Proof. It is a just modification of the proof of Proposition 3. Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)^n$ and express it as

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi(\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) + (x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) \cdot \int_0^1 \nabla\varphi(t(x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) + \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta))\ dt$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using this, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle f - f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}, \varphi \rangle_{W^{-1,p}, W_0^{1,p}} \\
&\quad = \underbrace{\int_\Theta F(\theta)\varphi(X(\theta))\ d\theta - \int_\Theta F(\theta)\varphi(\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) \left(\int_\Omega \delta^\varepsilon(x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta))\ dx \right) d\theta}_{=I_1} \\
&\quad \underbrace{- \int_0^1 \int_\Theta \hat{F}^\zeta(\theta) \int_\Omega \delta^\varepsilon_{\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)}(x)(x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) \cdot \nabla\varphi(t(x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) + \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta))\ dx d\theta dt}_{=I_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate $|I_1|$, we further divide it as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 = \underbrace{\int_\Theta [F(\theta) - \hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)]\varphi(X(\theta))\ d\theta}_{=I_{11}} + \underbrace{\int_\Theta \hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)[\varphi(X(\theta)) - \varphi(\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta))]\ d\theta}_{=I_{12}} \\
+ \underbrace{\int_\Theta \hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)\varphi(\hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)) \left(1 - \int_\Omega \delta^\varepsilon(x - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta))\ dx \right) d\theta}_{=I_{13}}.
\end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Proposition 3, we derive

$$|I_{13}| \le C\|\hat{F}^\zeta\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \left| 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \delta^\varepsilon(y)\ dy \right| \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}.$$

By (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{11}| &\le C\|F - \hat{F}^\zeta\|_{L^p(\Theta)} \|\varphi\|_{L^{p'}(\Theta)} \\
&\le C\zeta |F|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We apply Morrey's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_{12}| &\le C \int_\Theta |\hat{F}^\zeta(\theta)| \cdot |X(\theta) - \hat{X}^\zeta(\theta)|^{1-n/p'} \cdot \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}}\ d\theta \\
&\le C\zeta^{1-n/p'} \|\hat{F}^\zeta\|_{L^1(\Theta)} |X|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Theta)^n} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Estimation for $|I_2|$ is done in exactly the way as the proof of Proposition 3, that is, we deduce

$$|I_2| \le C\|\hat{F}^\zeta\|_{L^1(\Theta)} \|\rho\delta^\varepsilon\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|\varphi\|_{W^{1,p'}}.$$

Finally, noting $\|\hat{F}^\zeta\|_{L^1(\Theta)} \le C\|F\|_{L^\infty(\Theta)}$, we get the disired inequality. □

Applying Proposition 18 instead of Proposition 3, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 19. *Let (u, π) and $(u_h^\varepsilon, \pi_h^\varepsilon)$ be solutions of (5) and (15) with (12), respectively, where f^ε is replaced by $f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ defined as (22). In addition to assumptions of Theorem 15, we assume that $F \in C^1(\Theta)$. Further, let $\zeta = \gamma_2 h$ with a positive constant γ_2. Then, error estimates (19) and (20) remain true.*

5 Numerical experiments

Throughout this section, we let $\Omega = (-1,1)^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\Gamma = B(0,1/2)$. We consider the stationary Stokes problem

$$-\nu\Delta u + \nabla\pi = f + g \text{ in } \Omega, \quad \nabla \cdot u = 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \quad u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Herein, we have added an extra outer force $g = (1,0)$ in order to illustrate a pressure jump across Γ. We also set $\Theta = [0, 2\pi]$ and

$$X(\theta) = \frac{1}{2}(\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)).$$

In accordance to the simplest elasticity modeling (see [2, 13]), we take $F(\theta) = \kappa\partial^2 X/\partial\theta^2$ with κ is a suitable positive constant. Specifically, taking $\kappa = 2$, we set

$$F(\theta) = -\left(\cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)\right).$$

We deal with the following problem: Find $(u_h^\varepsilon, p_h^\varepsilon) \in V_h \times Q_h$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &a(u_h^\varepsilon, v_h) + b(p_h^\varepsilon, v_h) = (f^{\varepsilon,\zeta} + g, v_h)_{L^2} && (\forall v_h \in V_h), \\ &b(q_h, u_h^\varepsilon) = 0 && (\forall q \in Q_h). \end{aligned}$$

Herein, $f^{\varepsilon,\zeta}$ is defined as (22) and $\zeta = 2\pi/M$, $\theta_i = i\zeta$, $0 \le i \le M$. As a choice of δ^ε, we examine the following discrete delta function

$$\phi(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \cos(\pi s)\right) & (|s| \le 1) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

For discretization, we take $\mathscr{T}_h$ as a uniform mesh composed of $2N^2$ congruent right-angle triangles; each side of Ω is divided into N intervals of the same length. Then each small square is decomposed into two equal triangles by a diagonal. Each parameters are set as follows:

$$h = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{N}, \quad \varepsilon = h, \quad M = N, \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta = \frac{2\pi}{M} = \sqrt{2}\pi\varepsilon.$$

To confirm convergence results described in Theorems 15 and 19, we compute the following quantities:

$$E_h^{r(0)} = \|\tilde{u} - u_h\|_{L^r}, \quad E_h^{r(1)} = \|\tilde{u} - u_h\|_{W^{1,r}}, \quad \text{and} \quad E_h^{r(3)} = \|\tilde{\pi} - \pi_h\|_{L^r},$$

where $(\tilde{u}, \tilde{\pi}) \in V_{h'} \times Q_{h'}$ denotes the numerical solution using a finer triangulation $\mathcal{T}_{h'}$. Moreover, we compute

$$\rho_h^{r(i)} = \frac{\log E_{2h}^{r(i)} - \log E_h^{r(i)}}{\log 2h - \log h} \quad (i = 1, 2, 3).$$

The result is reported in Table 1–3. We observe from Table 1 that convergence rates of the $W^{1,1}$-error for velocity is first-order while that of the L^1-error for pressure is larger than 1. It is also observed that as p becomes larger, each convergence rate becomes worse. Nevertheless, the rate of the L^2-error for velocity is still larger than 1; see Table 3. All of those numerical results support our theoretical results. From those numerical observations, we infer that the following optimal-order error estimate,

$$\|u^\varepsilon - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,r}} + h\|u^\varepsilon - u_h^\varepsilon\|_{L^r} \le Ch^{1-\alpha}$$

actually holds true. However, we postpone the proof of this conjecture for future study.



Figure 2: Profile of pressure π_h^ε for $N = 80$. A jump of pressure is observed across Γ so that π_h^ε becomes a discontinuous function.

h	$E_h^{1(1)}$	$\rho_h^{1(1)}$	$E_h^{1(2)}$	$\rho_h^{1(2)}$	$E_h^{1(3)}$	$\rho_h^{1(3)}$
0.2828	0.000436582	—	0.0104959	—	0.0508396	—
0.1414	0.00010817	2.0129	0.00525413	0.9983	0.0195045	1.382
0.0707	2.61239e-05	2.0498	0.00262956	0.9986	0.00892026	1.128
0.0353	7.315e-06	1.8364	0.0012387	1.086	0.00269059	1.729

Table 1: Convergence rates in $W^{1,r} \times L^r$ with $r = 1$.

h	$E_h^{1.5(1)}$	$\rho_h^{1.5(1)}$	$E_h^{1.5(2)}$	$\rho_h^{1.5(2)}$	$E_h^{1.5(3)}$	$\rho_h^{1.5(3)}$
0.2828	5.92276e-06	—	0.000648725	—	0.00932687	—
0.1414	9.07843e-07	1.803	0.000298948	0.745	0.00291411	1.118
0.0707	1.51842e-07	1.719	0.000150538	0.659	0.00113506	0.906
0.0353	2.37657e-08	1.783	7.14263e-05	0.717	0.000222016	1.569

Table 2: Convergence rates in $W^{1,r} \times L^r$ with $r = 3/2$.

h	$E_h^{2(1)}$	$\rho_h^{2(1)}$	$E_h^{2(2)}$	$\rho_h^{2(2)}$	$E_h^{2(3)}$	$\rho_h^{2(3)}$
0.2828	8.89239e-08	—	4.5878e-05	—	0.00196196	—
0.1414	8.78242e-09	1.669	1.98618e-05	0.60390	0.000535873	0.9361
0.0707	1.03983e-09	1.539	1.02922e-05	0.47422	0.000176548	0.8009
0.0353	1.05306e-10	1.651	5.33301e-06	0.47426	2.25745e-05	1.4836

Table 3: Convergence rates in $W^{1,r} \times L^r$ with $r = 2$.

Acknowledgement

NS is supported by CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15H03635, 15K13454.

References

[1] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev Spaces*, volume 140 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003.

[2] D. Boffi, L. Gastaldi, and L. Heltai. Numerical stability of the finite element immersed boundary method. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 17(10):1479–1505, 2007.

[3] S. C. Brenner and L. R. Scott. *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, volume 15 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer, New York, third edition, 2008.

[4] V. Girault, R. H. Nochetto, and L. R. Scott. Max-norm estimates for Stokes and Navier-Stokes approximations in convex polyhedra. *Numer. Math.*, 131(4):771–822, 2015.

[5] V. Girault and P. A. Raviart. *Finite Element Methods for Navier-Stokes Equations*, volume 5 of *Springer Series in Computational Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[6] Z. Li. On convergence of the immersed boundary method for elliptic interface problems. *Math. Comp.*, 84(293):1169–1188, 2015.

[7] Y. Liu and Y. Mori. Properties of discrete delta functions and local convergence of the immersed boundary method. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 50(6):2986–3015, 2012.

[8] Y. Liu and Y. Mori. L^p convergence of the immersed boundary method for stationary Stokes problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 52(1):496–514, 2014.

[9] V. Maz'ya and J. Rossmann. L_p estimates of solutions to mixed boundary value problems for the Stokes system in polyhedral domains. *Math. Nachr.*, 280(7):751–793, 2007.

[10] Y. Mori. Convergence proof of the velocity field for a Stokes flow immersed boundary method. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 61(9):1213–1263, 2008.

[11] C. S. Peskin. *Flow Patterns Around Heart Valves: A Digital Computer Method for Solving the Equations of Motion.* PhD thesis, Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, 7 1972. order number: 7230378.

[12] C. S. Peskin. Numerical analysis of blood flow in the heart. *J. Computational Phys.*, 25(3):220–252, 1977.

[13] C. S. Peskin. The immersed boundary method. *Acta Numer.*, 11:479–517, 2002.

[14] M. Tabata. Finite element schemes based on energy-stable approximation for two-fluid flow problems with surface tension. *Hokkaido Math. J.*, 36(4):875–890, 2007.